



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

May 15, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: Institutions of Higher Education

FROM: Sally Vaughn, Ph.D. *Sally*
Deputy Superintendent/Chief Academic Officer

SUBJECT: 2008-2009 Title II, Part A(3)
Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program

For 2008-2009, the Michigan Department of Education is authorized to award approximately \$2.7 million for the Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program. Grants are awarded for a period of approximately 22 months with an expected contingency award date in July 2008 and an official award date in September 2008.

The focus of this request for applications continues to be on the provision of research-based professional learning opportunities to teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals, which will result in increased learning for all students. These grants are available to higher education departments of teacher education in partnership with higher education departments of arts and sciences and high-poverty local education agencies. Please pay special attention to the priorities and funding criteria in the application package.

The purpose of these grants is to support partnerships in the provision of professional learning opportunities needed to achieve the goal of having highly qualified teachers in all classrooms with deep knowledge of the content they are assigned to teach and instructional delivery skills to meet learning needs of all students.

Guidelines and Instructions for the 2008-2009 Title II, Part A(3) funding cycle will be located at www.michigan.gov/mde under GRANTS/2007-2008 Title II, Part A(3), Improving Teacher Quality **after May 16, 2008**.

A Technical Assistance Webinar will be provided on Wednesday, May 28, 2008, 1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. A Technical Assistance Meeting will be held on June 4, 2008, 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 p.m. at the Michigan NCA State Office, 826 Municipal Way, Lansing, Michigan.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • JOHN C. AUSTIN – VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER
NANCY DANHOF – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER
REGINALD M. TURNER • CASANDRA E. ULBRICH

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

The May 28, 2008 session will be hosted in the Hannah Building in Lansing and available to the first twenty sites to register. At the June 4, 2008 session, light refreshments will be available; lunch will not be provided.

Participation in either session is highly recommended if you are considering applying for these funds, as criteria may need explanation. Please fax the attached form to register. (Note registration deadlines.)

Deadline for Submission of Application: **June 27, 2008
Friday, 11:59 p.m.**

Application Available via MEGS: **May 23, 2008**

Estimated Available Funds: **\$2.7 million**

Estimated Range of Awards: **Up to \$200,000**

Estimated Number of Awards: **13-15**

Project Period: **Contingency approval in July 2008. Date of formal approval is anticipated to be September 2008. Project period runs from September 2008 through June 30, 2010.**

Budget Period: **Up to 22 months**

Should you have questions regarding this information or other aspects of this grant program, please contact Donna L. Hamilton, Education Consultant, Professional Preparation and Development Unit, at HamiltonD3@michigan.gov or 517/241-4546.

MICHIGAN STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Criteria for Title II, Part A(3): Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program

The State Board of Education (SBE) has adopted as its strategic goal, "Attain substantial and meaningful improvement in academic achievement for all students/children with primary emphasis on high priority schools and students." In addition, the SBE has adopted the following five strategic initiatives and adopted policy recommendations in each area to implement the goal:

- Ensuring Excellent Educators
- Elevating Educational Leadership
- Embracing the Information Age
- Ensuring Early Childhood Literacy
- Integrating Communities and Schools

To the extent possible, all grant criteria and grant awards will include priority consideration of the Strategic Goal and the Strategic Initiatives.

BACKGROUND/PURPOSE OF GRANT

☒ Competitive

☐ Formula

☐ New

☐ Continuation

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 authorizes a teacher and principal professional development competitive grants program defined within Title II, Part A(3), of the legislation. The competitive grants program supports the formation of partnerships between high-need Local Educational Agencies (LEAs), as defined in Section 2101A(3) of the NCLB Act, colleges or departments of teacher education, and colleges or departments of arts and sciences. The program is intended to provide grant awards to support teacher and principal professional development in the core academic subjects. It is the intent of this program to coordinate professional development needed to achieve the goal of having a highly qualified teacher in every classroom who has deep knowledge of the content that he/she is assigned to teach. All grant projects must provide a minimum of 90 contact hours of course work or professional development in the content area. The 90 contact hours will meet the highly qualified requirements of teachers as prescribed in "Michigan's Definition of Highly Qualified Teachers."

TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE

There is approximately \$2.7 million available annually to fund competitive grant awards to support teacher, principal, and paraprofessional professional development. A portion of these funds (a minimum of \$400,000) will be targeted for projects that involve small or rural schools that meet the high poverty criteria. The Office of Professional Preparation Services proposes to manage a competitive process for the awarding of grants from the available funds.

LEGISLATION

President Bush signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act - No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 - into law on January 8, 2002. The legislation focuses on improving student achievement for all students, especially children in the nation's most disadvantaged schools and communities. Title II, Part A(3), authorizes the Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program for establishing partnerships between high-need LEAs, colleges or departments of teacher education, and colleges or departments of arts and sciences to provide professional development to teachers, paraprofessionals, and principals.

RATIONALE FOR CRITERIA/STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION PRIORITIES

The Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program further assists the SBE with the goal of prioritizing service to low-performing schools. The program addresses the strategic initiatives of ensuring excellent educators because priority is given to applicants that propose partnerships between high-need LEAs and Institutions of Higher Education (IHE).

CRITERIA

☒ Defined in Legislation ☐ Defined in Department's Grant ☒ Proposed by Staff

Consistent with the priorities and criteria it has announced for selection of grant recipients (including priority consideration to grants that implement particular recommendations of the SBE's Ensuring Excellent Educators Task Force and its Board-adopted policy recommendations), the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) must make awards of Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Program funds to support the following types of partnership activities to enhance student achievement in participating high-need LEAs:

1. Professional development activities in core academic subjects to ensure that:
 - a. Teachers and highly qualified paraprofessionals (and principals, when appropriate) have subject matter knowledge in the academic subjects that the teachers teach (including knowledge of how to use computers and other technology to enhance student learning). This will be consistent with Standard 7 of the Professional Standards for Michigan Teachers (PSMT); and
 - b. Principals have the instructional leadership skills to help them work more effectively with teachers to help students master core academic subjects consistent with the recommendations of the SBE Task Force on Elevating Educational Leadership.
2. Development and provision of assistance to LEAs and to their teachers, highly qualified paraprofessionals, or school principals, in providing sustained, high-quality professional development activities that:

- a. Ensure that participants can use challenging state academic content standards, student academic achievement standards, and state assessments, to improve instructional practices and student academic achievement;
- b. Include intensive programs designed to prepare individuals to provide instruction related to the professional learning described in the preceding paragraph to others in their schools; and
- c. Include activities of partnerships between one or more LEA, one or more of the LEA's schools, and one or more IHE for the purpose of improving teaching and learning at low-performing schools.

Eligibility is limited to partnerships comprised at a minimum of (1) a private or public IHE and the division of the institution that prepares teachers (and principals when appropriate to the project); (2) a school of arts and sciences; and (3) a high-need LEA (see below).

An eligible partnership may also include another LEA, a public charter school, an elementary school or secondary school, an educational service agency, a nonprofit educational organization, another IHE, a school of arts and sciences within that IHE, the division of that IHE that prepares teachers and principals, a nonprofit cultural organization, an entity carrying out pre-kindergarten programs, a teacher organization, a principal organization, or a business.

A high-need LEA is defined as one:

1. That serves not fewer than 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line; **OR**
2. For which not less than 20 percent of the children served by the agency are from families with incomes below the poverty line; **AND**
3. For which there is a high percentage of teachers not teaching in the academic subjects or grade levels that the teachers were trained to teach; **OR**
4. For which there is a high percentage of teachers with emergency, provisional, or temporary certification or licensing.

In accordance with the federal law, NCLB, absolute priority will be given to those proposals forming partnerships that include high-need LEAs. Furthermore, in recognition of the importance of the SBE's commitment to ensure quality teachers in priority schools, applicants are encouraged to include schools that have not met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) due to low performance on the Michigan Merit Exam or the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) in Mathematics or English Language Arts or by a subgroup, only as long as these LEAs are also eligible under the federal high-need LEA definition.

REQUIRED PARTICIPATION IN STATEWIDE EVALUATION

Each awardee will allocate five percent (5%) of their award toward a statewide evaluation of the Title II, Part A(3) projects to assess the impact of the professional development on teacher knowledge and skill, classroom practice, and evidence of impact on student achievement.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

All applications for a grant award must be made by Institutions of Higher Education.

OFFICE ADMINISTERING GRANT

Office of Professional Preparation Services

PROGRAM ADMINISTERING GRANT

Professional Preparation and Development Unit

PROGRAM CONTACT

Donna L. Hamilton at (517) 241-4546, or HamiltonD3@michigan.gov

A. GRANT CATEGORIES

Funding will be awarded in the following grant categories:

1. Partnerships for Professional Learning Opportunities in English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies:

Projects forming partnerships for the improvement in any of the above-mentioned curricular areas in which the project builds on:

- a. Teacher and principal understanding and implementation of the corresponding content expectations, as part of a comprehensive curriculum;
- b. Teacher instructional delivery skills as they relate to the corresponding content expectations, as part of a comprehensive curriculum; and
- c. Teacher skills in assessing student performance as they relate to the corresponding content expectations, as part of a comprehensive curriculum, and principal skills in using data to help them work more effectively with teachers.

All projects must substantiate the district's need to improve student achievement in the selected curricular areas and be able to demonstrate progress in meeting federal and state goals for all students, including the implementation of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) strategies to accommodate learner differences.

2. Partnerships for Professional Learning Opportunities that Result in Highly Qualified Status or Endorsement for Special Education Teachers Assigned to Grades 6-12:

Projects forming partnerships that result in the enhancement of content knowledge and instructional skills relevant to one or more of the core curricular areas AND result in Highly Qualified Status for Special Education teachers assigned to teach core academic subjects to students in grades 6-12.

All partnership projects must incorporate the use of the corresponding content expectations.

3. Partnerships for Professional Development to Increase the Skills of Middle School Pre-Algebra and Algebra Teachers, and/or High School Algebra Teachers to Instruct Students of All Ability Levels:

Projects forming partnerships that enhance the instructional skills of middle school mathematics and/or high school algebra teachers to meet the learning needs of students of all social, economic, and academic levels.

All partnership projects must incorporate the mathematics content expectations and design the professional learning format to give teacher participants the opportunity to try new instructional strategies with non-traditional algebra students, including the implementation of UDL, reflect on the results, and re-apply in subsequent instruction.

B. DISTRIBUTION OF GRANT FUNDS

An annual allocation of approximately \$2.7 million for competitive grants has been awarded to the State of Michigan. Grant awards will be made for up to \$200,000 to fund projects sustained over 22 months.

If the allocated amount of funds is not awarded, then the remaining funds will be used to support projects in other qualifying categories. In compliance with federal guidelines, 100% of the total grant allocation will be awarded for projects in the core academic subjects.

**2008-2009 Cycle of NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT, TITLE II, Part A (3)
IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM**

TITLE II OF P.L. 107-110

State Grants to Strengthen Skills of Teachers and Instruction in the Core Academic Curriculum

FEDERAL CFDA Number 84.367B

PART I - GENERAL INFORMATION AND PROGRAM GUIDELINES

The enclosed materials provide application information to enable public and independent IHEs to participate in the Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grants Program. A teacher preparation institution may apply for funding on behalf of a proposed partnership, which involves a high-need LEA, and a college/department of arts and sciences. The purpose of the program is to support the development and implementation of sustained and intensive high-quality professional development activities to better enable new and experienced teachers, as well as building administrators and paraprofessionals, to help all students meet challenging standards in the core academic subjects.

The MDE anticipates receiving approximately \$2.7 million for grants to be awarded by the SBE under the NCLB, Title II, Part A(3) Competitive Grant Program.

Consistent with the priorities and criteria it has announced for selection of grant recipients, the MDE must make awards of Improving Teacher Quality state grant funds to support partnership activities to enhance student achievement.

A. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

Any one of the Michigan universities approved by the SBE to prepare teachers and principals forming a partnership comprised of one or more high-need LEAs.

Eligibility is limited to partnerships comprised of a minimum of (1) a private or public IHE and the division of the institution that prepares teachers or principals; (2) a school of arts and sciences; and (3) a high-need LEA (as defined on page 3).

A list of eligible colleges and universities and their approved content programs is located at <https://mdoe.state.mi.us/proprep/>

An eligible partnership may also include another LEA, public charter school, elementary or secondary school, nonpublic school, educational service agency, nonprofit educational organization, another IHE, school of arts and sciences within that IHE, the division of that IHE that prepares teachers and principals, nonprofit cultural organization (NPO) (see below), an entity carrying out a pre-kindergarten program, a teacher organization, principal organization, or business.

An NPO for purposes of this application is one that has, as its primary purpose, the improvement of student learning in mathematics, science, reading, or other core academic subjects, and can document the provision of effective teacher training programs.

Each NPO applicant must be prepared to provide written evidence of:

1. Past demonstrated effectiveness in providing professional development for teachers in mathematics, science, reading, or other core academic subjects. Documentation should include: title, dates and location of activities; number of teachers who participated; names and titles of instructional personnel; a summary of course/workshop content and activities (syllabus); and evidence of project outcomes which may include data on improved student outcomes, the

final evaluation report, recruitment procedures, and resulting materials or publications.

2. **Financial Stability.** Documentation must include: a complete copy of the management letter from the most recent independently audited financial statement, evidence that the NPO is not dependent on this grant for continued existence of the organization, its current staff configuration; and evidence of official registration with the Michigan Department of Treasury as a 501(c) nonprofit organization whose corporate office is located in Michigan.

In accordance with the federal law, NCLB, absolute priority will be given to those proposals forming partnerships that include high-need LEAs. Furthermore, in recognition of the importance of the SBE's commitment to ensure quality teachers in priority schools, applicants are encouraged to include schools that have not met AYP due to low performance on the MEAP in Mathematics, English Language Arts, or by a subgroup, only as long as these LEAs are also eligible under the federal high-need LEA definition.

See the October 5, 2006, Non-Regulatory Draft Guidance for Title II, Part A on the USDE's website at: <http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/guidance.pdf>

B. APPLICATION PROCEDURES

Institutions interested in applying for a NCLB Improving Teacher Quality Competitive Grant must submit a completed application on Michigan Electronic Grant System (MEGS) by 11:59 p.m., Friday, June 27, 2008.

It is anticipated that contingency letters of award will be issued in July 2008 and official award letters will follow in August 2008. Although no funds may be expended until official award notices are received, colleges and universities are encouraged to use this time to continue to build on their partnership with their K-12 partners through planning and recruitment of participants.

C. REQUIRED COMPONENTS

In order to justify the professional development proposed to address the learning needs of all students, projects recommended for funding must:

1. Be a minimum of 90 contact hours of professional development in the core content area. The 90 contact hours will meet the highly qualified requirements of teachers whose teaching assignments may have changed, as prescribed in "Michigan's Definition of Highly Qualified Teachers".
2. Be clearly aligned with Michigan's content expectations, Vision and Principles of Universal Education, standards for teaching and learning, assessment, and professional development.
3. Be collaboratively planned by representatives of the population targeted to be served by the project. These should include local public and nonpublic school teachers and administrators, public and independent college/university faculty (including representatives of the education and arts and sciences units),

relevant professional organizations, informal education entities (museums, libraries, etc.), and the MDE curriculum staff when available.

Public and nonpublic school staff are encouraged to survey and critically evaluate their professional development needs through (a) student learning data as they relate to the core academic subjects, (b) examples of differentiated instruction, and (c) evidence of need for alternatives for engaging students in instruction and to initiate contact with their colleagues at higher education institutions to establish a partnership to provide the professional development identified.

4. All project organizers must show evidence of involving the nonpublic schools located within the geographic region of their public K-12 partners in **planning** for the grant project.
5. Indicate clear, substantive evidence (including, but not limited to, quantitative data) about educator professional learning needs and learning needs of all students, upon which this proposal is based.
6. Identify the current, scientifically-based research on which the proposed professional development is founded or, at a minimum, cite innovative and related theory and research on which the proposed professional development can reasonably build.
7. Address the continuum of teacher development, including novice and mastery levels.
8. Use various technologies for project implementation in support of teacher professional development and for advancing teacher technology competence, including the strategies of UDL.
9. Conduct internal evaluation which provides evidence of accomplishments and impact of professional development interventions on targeted audiences, including effects on participating teachers (i.e., content knowledge, skills, classroom practices, attitudes, UDL strategies). As appropriate, the internal evaluation should gather evidence of effects on students of participating teachers, such as student work, test scores, student projects and products.
10. Participate in cross-site, state-level evaluation using common instruments and procedures.

D. SELECTION OF AWARD RECIPIENTS

Grants will be awarded through a competitive review process. The review and scoring of each application will be based on criteria that support sustained and intensive high-quality professional development programs, designed to improve content knowledge and teaching skills in the core academic subjects for elementary and secondary teachers and other members of the instructional team.

Grant applications will be reviewed using a two-step process, including external and internal panels of experts. Because the number and type of applications received always exceeds the level of available funding, external panels will be used to review all eligible applications submitted.

Using a numerical scoring system, the review process is intended to identify the most promising applications for which funding should be considered. **See Scoring Rubric at the end of this document.**

These applications are then reviewed by an internal panel of MDE curriculum consultants, with the intent of coordinating funding and other initiatives to better meet the learning needs of students across the state.

The number of grants recommended for awards will be influenced, among other factors, by limited availability of funds, the quality of proposals submitted, geographical distribution, and the size of the final budget negotiated for each project.

E. FUNDING PRIORITIES

Priority will be given to projects that:

1. Include or address how local capacity will be built to sustain the initiative at the conclusion of the grant period;
2. Use proven strategies of adult learning and instructional delivery that result in improved student performance and those based on scientific research; and
3. Extra credit points will be awarded to those proposals directly serving schools not making AYP due to low performance on the MEAP in Mathematics or English Language Arts or due to low MEAP performance by a subgroup. The application must articulate the reason for not making AYP and show how the proposed project is designed to remedy the situation.

F. FORMATIVE DATA AND FINAL REPORT

The MDE has contracted with Science and Mathematics Program Improvement (SAMPI) at Western Michigan University to conduct a Title II program-level evaluation. In connection to that, all awardees of these grant funds are required to compile extensive information to provide a standardized set of data to assess the impact of this grant program. Each project director will be required to put into place a process for collecting the data throughout the project. The guidelines for the final report are located at http://www.michigan.gov/documents/MDEsTQualityReportFormat-ProjectDirectorsVersion_152399_7.doc.

The MDE has provided an Excel spreadsheet on which the school and participant data is submitted. It is located at http://www.michigan.gov/documents/MDEsTitleIIReportingSpreadsheet_152397_7.xls.

This data will provide a detailed picture of who is served, to what extent, from what kind of schools, how they are served in terms of project accomplishments, and nature of impact. This data also contributes to a statewide evaluation of this grant being done by SAMPI. (Assistance will be available to grant recipients who need help with data gathering, recording, and reporting.)

The awardee is expected to submit the required data as a formal part of their ongoing project evaluation as well as the final report. The awardee also is expected to submit a final narrative report which documents their internal evaluation of the project.

In addition to formative data provided to SAMPI, the final expenditure report for a project funded in this category must reflect the budget submitted with this application and must include, at a minimum, the following information:

- The amount of funds under the grant or subgrant;
- How the grantee or subgrantee used the funds;
- The total cost of project activities;
- The share of the cost provided from other sources; and
- Other records to facilitate an effective audit.

G. STATE OF MICHIGAN MONITORING VISITS

The MDE is required to monitor a cross section of the grant projects. Under ordinary circumstances, these monitoring visits are not conducted for the purpose of rescinding grants or penalizing grant recipients for information not collected. They occur for the purpose of collecting project information to ensure the proper implementation of the Title II Competitive Grant Program.

University staff must maintain and make available, in the event of a monitoring visit, evidence to support the complete implementation of the proposed project including the data referred to in Section F.

H. WHERE TO OBTAIN HELP

The instructions contained in these materials are issued by the MDE, which is the sole point of contact for this program. Questions regarding proposals should be directed to Donna L. Hamilton, Office of Professional Preparation Services, Michigan Department of Education, P.O. Box 30008, Lansing, Michigan 48909; by telephone at (517) 241-4546; or by e-mail at HamiltonD3@michigan.gov. Questions regarding the application on MEGS may be directed to Claudia Nicol by telephone at (517) 335-1151 or by e-mail at NicolC@michigan.gov.

PART II – REVIEW CRITERIA

REVIEW PROCESS

All applications will be reviewed and rated by the MDE staff as well as university, ISD, and K-12 representatives from the field having content and program administration expertise. Proposals are required to address all the identified criteria. **Proposals that exceed the allowed number of pages will be assessed a penalty of five (5) points for each page beyond the specified limit.**

REVIEW CRITERIA

All applications will be evaluated on the basis of the criteria described hereafter. The narrative portion of applications should address the criteria. The maximum possible number of points for all of the criteria is 172 (with an additional 10 bonus points possible for including a high-need school that is not making AYP due to low performance on the MEAP in Mathematics or English Language Arts or low MEAP performance by a subgroup). The value assigned for each criterion follows:

A. DEMONSTRATED NEED AND SIGNIFICANCE OF PROJECT (24 POINTS)

Proposals should represent a constructive and productive approach to the significant challenge facing the target audience to meet the learning needs of all students. The reviewers will look for:

1. The presence of strong evidence about the student and educator learning needs upon which the choice of professional development is based;
2. A description of the means by which the teachers of the target population were determined to be not yet highly qualified or teaching with an emergency, provisional, or temporary certificate or license;
3. A description of the actions taken to involve the nonpublic schools located within the geographic region of the K-12 partners in **planning** the grant project;
4. A description of the nature of the partnership with and commitment from the high need LEA(s) and the university and other partners;
5. A description of the actions taken previously by the IHE partner(s) and/or other entities to address the need, including current or past Title II A(3) projects; and
6. A description of actions taken previously by identified LEAs as partners in other projects, a description of results/improvements and reason for involvement in proposed project.

B. ROLES OF PARTNERS (12 POINTS)

Each application will be reviewed to determine the extent to which:

1. The role of the IHE education school partner and the responsibility of individuals named on Partner list for the project are described.
2. The role of the College of Arts and Sciences partner and the responsibility of individuals named on the Partner list are described.
3. The role of the specified **high-need LEA partner** and the responsibility of individuals named on the Partner list are described.

C. PLAN OF OPERATION (48 POINTS)

A review of each application will be made to determine the thoroughness of the plan of operation for meeting the needs of the target population. In making this determination, the reviewers will look for:

1. A plan with a minimum duration of 90 contact hours of professional development, allowing middle school and secondary teachers who require it to accumulate 90 hours of in-depth content knowledge and related pedagogy;
2. Identification of the current, scientifically-based research on which the proposed professional development is founded or, at a minimum, cites innovative related theory and research on which the proposed professional development can reasonably build;
3. A clear statement of the short-term and long-term goals of the project, the expected results and how attainment will be measured;
4. A clearly described implementation plan that addresses all of the required components (see C on page 10);
5. A plan to incorporate various technologies that support teacher professional development and advance teacher technology competence, including the UDL strategies;
6. A clear alignment with Michigan's Content Expectations, Vision and Principles of Universal Education, standards for teaching and learning, assessment and professional development;
7. A description of the conceptual model of adult teaching and learning on which the proposal is based. Appropriate literature references and examples of implementation of the model, as related to the identified needs, must be provided to support the rationale for selection of that particular model;
8. A plan to address the continuum of teacher development and induct new participants into the program as they move from novice to mastery and join the learning community to gain expertise in core content, as well as technology competence UDL strategies;

9. A plan to encourage/ensure that instructors/instructional faculty will model appropriate teaching behaviors, methods, and strategies for engaging underrepresented students;
10. An activity plan, including proposed objectives, key activities to accomplish the objectives with benchmarks to determine progress toward objectives; a time line; and a plan for disseminating information about project outcomes;
11. A plan for effective administration of the project identifying responsibilities of project staff; and
12. A plan to continue to involve appropriate groups in the project, including but not limited to, local boards, teachers and administrators, mathematics, science and/or other resource centers, public museums, libraries, business and industry.

D. EVALUATION PLAN (24 POINTS)

Review of applications will be based on the extent to which proposals include:

1. A plan to collect and maintain data consistent with required final reporting, including documentation of participation levels and professional development/other activities, evidence of impact on participating teachers and other educators, partnerships, subject-matter faculty involvement, etc. (see report requirements at MDE website). Indicate how data will be collected.
2. A plan to conduct internal evaluation to determine effects of the program on participating teachers, administrators, or other targeted audiences that includes pre-program and end-of-program data collection. This can include (but should not be limited to) the required common cross-site teacher survey. Pre/post data collection should be pertinent to intended outcomes of the project and can include materials/products/projects created by teachers or other targeted audiences.
3. A plan to conduct systematic lesson/classroom observations among at least a credible sample of participating teachers, preferably on a pre- and end-of-project basis as a measure of changes in classroom practice, including the collection of teachers' lesson and unit plans which show change.
4. A description of specifically who will be responsible for collecting, maintaining, analyzing, and reporting the various kinds of data over the course of the project.
5. An indication of intent to coordinate internal evaluation activities with statewide cross-site evaluation as appropriate and to facilitate cross-site evaluator access to project participants and project-level evaluation data.
6. A plan to gather data about the effects of the project on the students of participating teachers, which might include systematic gathering of samples of student work or projects, test scores, or worksheets and reports.

E. LEARNING NEEDS OF UNDERREPRESENTED STUDENTS (12 POINTS)

Each application will be reviewed to determine the extent to which:

1. The instructional design addresses the professional learning needed to help participants accommodate the learning needs of **all students** in core content;
2. The instructional design addresses the professional learning needed to help participants motivate, support, and engage underrepresented students in instruction; and
3. Activities are specified to address and improve teachers' and/or principals' low expectations of, and negative attitudes toward, culturally different students.

F. BUDGET AND COST EFFECTIVENESS (16 POINTS)

Each application will be reviewed to determine the extent to which:

1. The budget is cost effective, adequate to support the proposed project only, and complies with the budget requirements of the Request for Payment (RFP), including identification of which partner "uses" the funds (see Special Rule 2132 below);
2. There is evidence of a clear relationship between budget items, project objectives, and anticipated results;
3. There is adherence to allowable costs; i.e., (a) indirect cost of no more than 8%, (b) consultant fees limited to no more than \$800/day, (c) participant stipends limited to \$200/day, (d) no purchase of classroom instructional materials (limited to only what is needed to conduct the professional development), (e) a minimum of 5% of the budget, as an expenditure for state-level evaluation and reports coordinated by the MDE, is set aside, (f) no purchase of nonexpendable supplies, (g) funds for the project director's participation in a mid-point meeting in Lansing at the end of the first year; and
4. That all expenditures are identified as to which partner directly benefits.

UNALLOWABLE COSTS: Costs of entertainment, including amusement, diversion, and social activities and any costs directly associated with such costs (such as tickets to shows or sports events, meals, lodging, rentals, transportation, and gratuities) are unallowable. Costs of alcoholic beverages are unallowable.

SPECIAL RULE Section 2132(c): The legislation requires that no single participant in an eligible partnership receiving a grant in this program may use more than 50% of the grant funds. For example, each of three partner entities (education, arts and sciences, and a high-need school) may share 1/3 of the total grant equally, or may use 50% of the grant with the other two sharing 25% each, etc., but none may use more than 50% of the total grant.

Note: Neither capital nor nonexpendable supply expenditures are allowed.

G. QUALIFICATIONS OF KEY PERSONNEL (16 POINTS)

A review of each application will be made to determine whether the qualifications of key personnel are appropriate. In making this determination, the reviewers will look for:

1. The qualifications of the project director and other key personnel to be used in the project (qualifications may be demonstrated by a resume or biographical sketch of the person who will fill the position or by a statement of required experience and education and a recruitment plan for individuals to be hired by the project);
2. The percentage of time each of the above persons will commit to the project;
3. Demonstration that the applicant (or partner) is qualified to address the instructional and learning needs of underrepresented populations, applying the principles of Universal Education; and
4. Demonstration that the applicant (or partner) is qualified and prepared to conduct and analyze the formative assessments needed to modify project activities, as needed.

H. APPLICANT'S COMMITMENT AND CAPACITY (20 POINTS)

Each application will be reviewed for information that shows the applicant is committed to, and capable of, the successful implementation and continuation of the project. In making this determination, consideration will be given to:

1. Evidence that the applicant is a state-approved teacher preparation institution (or is in partnership with one) and the proposed professional development is in a specific content at the appropriate level for which the institution has full state approval;
2. A description of the participatory nature of the partnership with, and commitment from, the high need LEA(s) and how the LEA will assist with recruiting participants;
3. Evidence that project results from collaborative planning by representatives of the population targeted to be served by the project. These should include local public and nonpublic school teachers and administrators, public and independent college/university faculty (including representatives of the education and arts and sciences units), relevant professional organizations, informal education entities (museums, libraries, etc.), and the MDE curriculum staff when available;
4. Evidence of previous successful experiences in facilitating projects associated with pre-K-12 professional development in the content areas addressed in this proposal; and
5. A statement of the institution's capacity and likelihood to continue the project when federal assistance ends, including a plan to identify and secure continuation funding.

I. INCLUDES SCHOOLS NOT ACCREDITED FOR CURRICULAR REASONS FOR NOT MAKING AYP (10 BONUS POINTS)

One of the LEAs serving as a partner on the project is included on the list of LEAs not accredited for curricular reasons, or not making AYP due to low performance on the MEAP in Mathematics or English Language Arts, or due to low MEAP performance by a subgroup.

ADDITIONAL REVIEW FACTORS

In addition to the criteria listed above, the SBE may apply other factors in making decisions to fund proposals, such as evidence that:

- a. The applicant has performed satisfactorily on previous projects, completed required evaluation tasks, exercised prudent fiscal management, and submitted final reports;
- b. The funding of the project will not result in duplication of effort;
- c. The project will serve specific geographic areas; and
- d. The project will facilitate the state in meeting the overall professional learning vision and standards, curriculum improvement, and teacher education goals.

PART III – APPLICATION AND INSTRUCTIONS

A. LENGTH OF NARRATIVE

Proposal narratives are to be no longer than 20 pages including charts and graphs. Appendices in the form of additional attachments, may be included with each proposal, although reviewers are not required to read these in detail and may not exceed 15 pages. Proposals are required to address all identified criteria. Narratives that exceed the allowed number of pages will be assessed a penalty of five (5) points for each page beyond the specified page limit.

Narratives are required to be double-spaced using no less than eleven (11) font size and no less than 1-inch margins. Proposals using less than the required spacing, font, and margin size will be assigned a penalty of twenty (20) points.

B. SUBMISSION DATE

The application must be submitted to the MEGS grant system **by 11:59 p.m. on June 27, 2008. Late submissions will not be accepted.**

C. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE MEETING/WEBINAR

IHEs that intend to submit an application for this cycle of funding are encouraged to participate in one of these sessions. Representatives who will be involved in developing and submitting the application may elect to attend the Technical Assistance Webinar on May 28, 2008 or participate in the Technical Assistance on June 4, 2008. The application submission is done electronically, through MEGS, and these sessions will include an explanation of how to use MEGS to submit the grant application.

Topics of the sessions will include:

1. The accepted source of data of high-poverty LEAs.
2. Changes in criteria from previous years.
3. The MDE categories for priorities in funding.
4. Creating and submitting your proposal using the MEGS application process.
5. Data requirements for the 2008-2009 projects.
6. The rubric for developing and evaluating applications.
7. A list of schools not accredited for curricular reasons, or for not making AYP due to low performance on the MEAP in Mathematics or English Language Arts, or low MEAP performance by a subgroup.

There are two options for technical assistance:

A Technical Assistance Webinar will be provided on Wednesday, May 28, 2008, 1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. in the Video Conference Room of the Hannah Building in Lansing. Individuals may register to participate electronically or by personally joining the session.

A Technical Assistance meeting will be held on Wednesday, June 4, 2008, 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m. at Michigan NCA State Office, 826 Municipal Way, Lansing, Michigan. Light refreshments will be available; lunch will not be provided.

Participation in either session is highly recommended if you are considering applying for these funds, as criteria may need explanation. Please fax the attached form to register.

Persons with disabilities needing accommodations for participation in this function are invited to contact the MDE to request mobility, visual, hearing, or other assistance. Please contact Claudia Nicol at (517) 335-1151 or by e-mail at NicolC@michigan.gov for assistance with special needs.

D. COMPLETING THE APPLICATION

All applications must be submitted on the MEGS grant system <http://megs.mde.state.mi.us/megsweb/>. All applicants must be authorized to use the grant system by their institution's Level 5 administrator assigned to MEGS. For help identifying that person, call Claudia Nicol at 517-335-1151. A separate application must be submitted for each project proposed. An institution may submit applications for several projects as long as the project director is different for each. Applicants for all grants are required to use the following instructions for completing the application.

The MEGS application will require information in the following sections (there is a HELP screen available for any section that is not self-explanatory):

1. GRANT

Important Information regarding the Title II Improving Teacher Quality Grant – This section provides an overview of this competitive grant program.

Assurances and Certifications – By submitting this application, the applicant is making the assurances shown listed on the screen in this section.

Application Description – Enter the project title here; please include in the title the curriculum content that you intend to address in your project, i.e. English Language Arts, Mathematics, etc.

2. MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

Control Access to this Application – Authorized users can use this section to add, edit, or delete existing users in this application.

View a PDF of this Application – This section allows the applicant to request a PDF of the application. Preparation of PDF usually requires 24 hours.

View a Blank PDF – Once the PDF is available, it is located in this section of MEGS.

View Last Confirmation of Submittal – Print this screen as a confirmation that you have transmitted the final version of the application. This option will not appear until you have submitted the application.

3. GENERAL INFORMATION

Grant Contact and Fiscal Agent Information – This screen provides all the applicant/fiscal agent data. Please complete all items, as each determines where letters are sent, and who receives information about the grant award.

Partner Information – List of partners you have added using the next screen.

Add/Review Partners – Screen to add or review the grant partners.

Verification of Collaborative Planning – Enter proposal title and the details of ALL collaborative planning meetings. The date, agenda, and list of participants of the FIRST planning meeting must be named and attached here.

Checking NO when asked about including non-public schools will disqualify the application.

Grant Categories – Choose from the drop-down menu, the category in which you are applying.

4. BUDGET PAGES

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality – Complete the Budget Summary form and attach a Budget Detail. Only the allowable categories are shown in the budget summary form.

Projects that receive financial or other contributions from the LEA partner and others must keep a statement confirming that contribution on file.

5. PROGRAM INFORMATION

Program Information Page Summary – This keeps track of the pages that have been saved and the steps of application that have been completed.

Narrative Rubric – This is the rubric for evaluating proposals submitted for consideration for funding under this competitive grant program.

Narrative – Use the same title you have entered into the description line of the application here and attach your narrative. Be sure to follow the directions regarding the narrative provided below and on pages 14-19 in this document.

Abstract – Attach a 200-word description of this project. Complete this section after completing the entire application. See the Help Screen of this section to view the subsections of the abstract, using the text box provided. The abstract will be used when a description of your project is needed for public documents. **Please list in the abstract the school partners served and the curriculum content addressed by the project. The abstract is not to exceed two (2) pages.** (Note: The abstract will be disseminated as you have written it.)

6. ATTACHMENTS

Miscellaneous – You may name and attach up to 15 pages of appendices to provide additional information about your proposal or prior projects here.

Narrative - Prepare a concise and clearly written narrative statement of not more than twenty (20) pages, including charts and graphs, that addresses the review criteria listed. (See Review Criteria on pages 14-19 of this document.)

The following criteria will be used by the review panelists to assess each application:

- Demonstrated need and significance of project including evidence indicating need on part of both student and teacher for the proposed professional development. (24 points)
- Roles of Partners. (12 points)
- Plan of operation including the research base verifying the effectiveness of the proposed professional development. (48 points)
- Evaluation plan. (24 points)
- Learning needs of underrepresented students. (12 points)
- Budget and cost effectiveness. (16 points)
- Qualifications of key personnel. (16 points)
- Applicant's Commitment and Capacity. (20 points)

E. FINAL PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND REVIEW PROCESS

All final proposals must be submitted by an IHE which also serves as the fiscal agent. There is no limit placed on the number of proposals an institution may submit. Each individual project director may submit no more than one proposal per grant year.

All applications will be reviewed and rated in accordance with the format and review criteria cited in the general instructions. Up to 172 points will be awarded and distributed based on the applicable criteria with an additional 10 bonus points possible for inclusion of schools not accredited or not making AYP for curricular reasons. It is essential that each evaluative criterion be addressed.

F. RUBRIC

Following is a rubric to help proposal writers discern whether they have sufficiently addressed all the required elements of the RFP and to help reviewers score the applications.

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

To qualify, the application must have all of the following to be considered for support:
1. Required partners: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o College of Education and o College of Arts and Sciences and o One or more high-need school(s) as defined in #2.
2. High-need school(s) must meet this federal definition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o LEA serving not fewer than 10,000 children from low income families OR o No less that 20% of children from families living below the poverty line (as defined by the 2002 U.S. Census) AND o High percentage (is not federally defined as of 1/16/2004) of teachers with emergency or temporary certificates OR o Not teaching in the academic or subject area for which they were trained.
3. Evidence of research base for the professional development proposed for teachers, and/or principals, and/or paraprofessionals.
4. Evidence of collaborative planning.
5. Application must apply in one of the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Partnerships for Professional Learning Opportunities in English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. o Partnerships for Professional Learning Opportunities that Result in Highly Qualified Status or Endorsement for Special Education Teachers Assigned to Grades 6-12. o Partnership for Professional Development to Increase the Skills of Middle School Pre-Algebra and Algebra Teachers, and/or High School Algebra Teachers to Instruct Students of All Ability Levels.
6. Budget meets Section 2132 (c): No single participant in an eligible partnership receiving a grant may use more than 50% of the grant funds.
7. Proposals are required to be double-spaced (not including charts and graphs), using no less than 11 point font size and no less than 1 inch margins.
STOP REVIEWING HERE IF THE PROPOSAL HAS NOT MET THE CRITERIA LISTED ABOVE
To continue: Record your written comments and evidence from the grant application, with page numbers, for each line of the rubric to justify your score. Be sure your written comments justify the score you assign; otherwise good proposals may not be funded and visa-versa.

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

A. Need (24 Points)							
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive		Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor		Comprehensive, Rigorous		Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Lacks a description of the specific needs or problems to be addressed including student learning needs and the professional development needs of the staff;		Describes the needs or problems with minimal definition or clarity and provides a minimal link between student learning needs and the need for professional development;		Clearly describes the needs or problems along with supporting evidence and provides a vague link between student learning needs and professional development needs of staff;		Describes need(s)/ problem(s) to be addressed by including the direct link between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Student learning needs data; and ❑ The professional development needs data of staff; 	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Lacks reference to the number or identity of not yet highly qualified teachers or teachers with a limited certificate;		Refers to teachers who qualify as not-yet highly qualified or who are teaching with a limited certificate, but does not address how they were identified;		Provides a general description of how teacher participants were identified as not yet highly qualified or as teaching on a limited certificate;		Provides a detailed description of the process used to identify the not yet highly qualified status or as teaching with a limited certificate including how many, district, etc.;	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
No evidence of contact with nonpublic schools;		Evidence of contact with nonpublic schools;		Description of responses from nonpublic schools and subsequent involvement;		Description of plan for involving nonpublic schools in planning professional development intervention and evaluation;	

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

A. Need (24 Points)							
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive		Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor		Comprehensive, Rigorous		Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
The partnership between the university and the LEA partner(s) is not addressed in the proposal;		A brief description of the partnership between the university and the LEA(s), with attention to needs of schools that meet poverty criteria;		A detailed description of what each university and each LEA partner has agreed to do, with attention to how needs will be met in schools that meet poverty criteria;		A description of the nature of the partnership and evidence of commitment from the university partners and the high poverty LEA(s) and how the participants will be recruited;	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Contains no description of prior strategies;		Contains vague reference to prior strategies used to address the need;		Contains a clear reference to prior strategies used by the IHE partners to address the need;		Describes actions taken previously by the IHE partner(s) and/or other entities to address the need and summarizes results;	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
No presentation of results/ impacts of previous programming; no reasons given for need for partner involvement in proposed project;		Description of results/ improvements general and vague; reasons for partner involvement also general and vague;		Results of previous projects are described, but not adequate to show the nature and extent of improvements to date resulting from past efforts AND reasons for partnering are described, but no substantiation of why they are important; and		Presentation of substantive and systematic research/ evaluation findings showing improvements to date resulting from past efforts AND clearly described and substantiated reasons why the partnership should be supported.	

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

B. Roles of Partners (12 Points)			
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive	Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
The IHE partner is listed on Partner page;	The IHE partner is listed on Partner page and mentioned in narrative;	The IHE partner's role in supporting and planning the project is described in narrative;	The IHE partner's role in planning the project and in providing pedagogy strategies is described in narrative;
The College of Arts & Sciences partner is listed on Partner page;	The College of Arts & Sciences partner is listed on Partner page and mentioned in narrative;	The College of Arts & Sciences partner is listed on Partner page and role in supporting and planning the project is described in narrative;	The College of Arts & Sciences partner's role in planning the project and in providing current content information is described in narrative;
The high-need LEA partner is listed on Partner page;	The high-need LEA partner is listed on Partner page and mentioned in narrative;	The high-need LEA partner is listed on Partner page and role in supporting and planning the project is described in narrative; and	The high-need LEA partner's role in planning the project and connecting its activities to LEA needs is described in the narrative.

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

C. Plan of Operation (48 Points)							
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive		Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor		Comprehensive, Rigorous		Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Does not include long-term professional development that allows for acquisition and application of new knowledge;		Includes a description of professional development that includes one-day or short term activities, but does not total a minimum of 90 hours for acquisition and application of new content knowledge;		Includes a description of professional development that totals 90 hours (not one-day or short-term) and is a structured series of activities, allowing time for acquisition of new content knowledge but does not allow time for application and related pedagogy;		Includes a clear and detailed description of professional development that is at least 90 hours duration (not one-day or short-term) and is a structured series of activities, allowing time for acquisition and application of new content knowledge and related pedagogy;	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Makes no connection between proposed professional development and scientifically based research;		Includes a weak connection between the proposed professional development and scientifically-based research;		Includes a description of scientifically-based research related to the proposed professional development;		Includes a specific reference to the scientifically-based research which influenced the proposed response to the identified need(s) and the source of the research;	

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

C. Plan of Operation (48 Points)							
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive		Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor		Comprehensive, Rigorous		Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Has no evidence of short-term and/or long-term goals for the proposed professional development;		Lists proposed short-term goals; goals not aligned to stated needs for professional development;		Has both proposed short-term and long-term goals which clearly address the needs of teachers and/or principals for professional development and describes how results will be gathered;		Presents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Both detailed short-term and long-term goals of the project; ❑ The expected results that support student achievement as an outcome of professional development; and ❑ How attainment will be measured; 	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Has no implementation plan and/or does not address required components;		Incomplete and/or unclear implementation plan that addresses some of the required components;		Includes a clear and detailed implementation plan that addresses most of the required components;		Includes a clear and detailed implementation plan that addresses all the Required Components. (See Guidelines packet page 10);	

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

C. Plan of Operation (48 Points)							
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive		Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor		Comprehensive, Rigorous		Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Uses technology only for operational purposes;		Uses technology for operations and correspondence;		Uses technology for operations and correspondence, incorporates technology in professional development intervention, expects participants to use teaching technology as part of professional development intervention;		Uses technology for operations and correspondence, expects participants to use teaching technology as part of professional development intervention and to implement UDL;	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Lists the use of Michigan Content Expectations for content, professional development, is consistent with the Michigan Standards for Professional Development;		Assures use of Michigan Content Expectations, standards for teaching and learning; professional development is consistent with Michigan's Standards for Professional Development;		Assures use of Michigan Content Expectations standards for teaching and learning, assessment; professional development is consistent with Michigan Standards for Professional Development;		Assures the use of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Michigan Content Expectations, standards for content, teaching and learning, assessment; ❑ Principles of Universal Education; and ❑ Process consistent with the Michigan Professional Development Standards; 	

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

C. Plan of Operation (48 Points)							
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive		Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor		Comprehensive, Rigorous		Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
No conceptual model of adult teaching and learning is included;		A model of adult teaching and learning is provided but not incorporated;		A model of adult teaching and learning is incorporated into professional development intervention;		A model of adult teaching and learning is incorporated into the intervention with specific links to needs of participants;	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
No attention to continuum of teacher development;		Includes description of continuum of teacher development and intention for helping teachers move from novice to mastery in content area;		Includes description of continuum of teacher development and plans for helping teachers move from novice to mastery, gaining expertise in content area and technology within learning communities;		Includes description of continuum of teacher development, plans for helping teachers move from novice to mastery, gaining expertise in content area, technology, and Universal Education; and build learning communities within buildings;	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
There is no plan to assure/encourage that instructors/instructional faculty will model appropriate teaching behaviors and methods;		Includes a plan that provides limited assurance that instructors/instructional faculty will use appropriate teaching methods;		Includes a plan that provides assurance that instructors/instructional faculty will model exemplary teaching behaviors and methods;		Includes a plan to assure that instructors/instructional faculty will model exemplary teaching behaviors, methods, and strategies for engaging underrepresented students;	

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

C. Plan of Operation (48 Points)							
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive		Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor		Comprehensive, Rigorous		Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
The operation plan lacks clarity in the proposed objectives, strategies, benchmarks and a timeline of activity;		Provides an operation plan that is not fully developed to include clearly stated objectives, strategies, benchmarks, and a time line of activity;		Provides an operation plan that clearly states the objectives, strategies, benchmarks to assess progress, and a timeline of activity;		Includes an activity plan with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Proposed objectives; ❑ Key activities to accomplish the objectives with benchmarks to determine progress toward objectives; ❑ A timeline; and ❑ A plan for disseminating information about the project outcomes; 	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Includes an operation plan that does not describe the method for administering the grant, nor the identity of responsible staff;		Describes an operation plan with limited information on the administration of the grant or the roles of responsible staff;		Describes a plan for administration of the grant and identifies staff responsibilities;		Describes a plan for effective administration of the project with responsibilities delineated for each staff person;	

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

C. Plan of Operation (48 Points)							
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive		Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor		Comprehensive, Rigorous		Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Contains no plan for the continued involvement of appropriate groups;		Includes a plan in which members of groups are initially involved in the design of the project;		Includes a plan for the initial and sporadic involvement of appropriate groups in the project; and		Includes a plan for the continued involvement of appropriate groups in the implementation of the project, including union representation, leadership, etc.	

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

D. Evaluation (24 Points)							
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive		Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor		Comprehensive, Rigorous		Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
No plan for collecting required data is provided. Only general statement about collecting participation, activity, and other descriptive data;		Plan is described with little or no detail about what, when, how, and who included in the proposal;		Plan is described, but elements missing from the description, such as what data will be collected, when or how that data will be gathered, how it will be maintained and reported, or who will be responsible for the various components of the plan. There is indication the applicant is familiar with the required final reporting requirements;		Plan is fully described, including what data will be collected, when and how data will be collected, how it will be maintained in a database or spreadsheet, how/when it will be reported, and who will do the work. There is clear indication the applicant understands the final reporting requirements;	

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

D. Evaluation (24 Points)							
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive		Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor		Comprehensive, Rigorous		Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
No internal evaluation plan is described. Only general statement(s) about conducting an internal evaluation;		Plan provides little or no detail about how program effects will be measured. Heavy focus on end-of-session satisfaction surveys, rather than measures about effects of the program. No mention about state-level cross-site participant survey;		Feasible plan described, but there are important gaps in details about the what, when, how, and who of the evaluation. Evaluation plan link to intended outcomes (or goals and objectives) missing. No discussion about any one or more of the following: measures (related to outcomes), data collection procedures, data maintenance plans, data analysis and reporting plans, responsibilities, or timelines. Mention made, but no detail provided about administration, of state-level cross-site participant survey;		Feasible plan, linked to intended outcomes (or goals and objectives), fully described. There is detailed information about measures (related to outcomes), data collection procedures, data maintenance plans, data analysis and reporting expectations, who will be responsible for evaluations task, and when they will be done. State-level pre/post participant survey included in the plan. Plan focused on impact of the project on participants. Evidence that pre/post data will be collected;	

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

D. Evaluation (24 Points)							
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive		Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor		Comprehensive, Rigorous		Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
No indication that systematic lesson/classroom observations will be conducted;		Vague description of plans for conducting observations provided. No details about who, what, when, how provided. No information about how data will be analyzed. Not linked to the evaluation plan;		Plan for observation described, but key elements missing, such as who will do the work, when, and with what instrument or procedure. Little information about how data will be analyzed and reported. No plans for a pre/post observation design or collection of teachers' lesson or unit plans;		Detailed description of lesson/classroom observations included in internal evaluation plan, including when they will be done, what information will be collected, instruments to be used, who will conduct the observations, how the data will be analyzed and reported. Evidence that pre/post observations will be conducted and teachers' lesson or unit plans will be collected;	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
No or only vague description of who will oversee, implement, maintain data, and analyze and report data;		Only a general description of who will oversee and implement the internal evaluation, maintain, analyze, and report data. No specific names provided;		Names of individuals provided who will do the evaluation work. Evaluation responsibilities of each person are not clear;		Names of individuals (and their affiliation to the project) provided. Description of their evaluation responsibilities given;	

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

D. Evaluation (24 Points)							
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive		Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor		Comprehensive, Rigorous		Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
No reference to coordinating local efforts with the statewide cross-site evaluation;		General statement indicating cooperation, but nothing about coordinating internal and cross-site evaluation. No mention about providing access to participants or internal evaluation data;		Indication applicant is aware of state-wide cross-site evaluation. Description of nature and extent of cooperation with state-level cross-site effort;		Applicant explains primary state-wide cross-site expectations. Link between internal and cross-site evaluation is clearly described. Description of nature and extent of cooperation with state-level cross-site efforts provided;	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
An intended outcome indicates project will have impact on students of participating teachers, but no description of how data will be gathered and reported;		An intended outcome indicates project will have impact on students of participating teachers, but description of how this will be evaluated is vague or indicates MEAP scores as the only measure of impact;		An intended outcome indicates project will have impact on students. There is general description of how this will be evaluated. More than just MEAP scores will be used. The what, when, how, and who is provided; and		An intended outcome indicates project will have impact on students. There is a detailed description of how this will be evaluated. It is incorporated in the evaluation plan. Describes measures to be used, along with data collection, analysis, and reporting. Goes well beyond MEAP scores as a measure.	

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

E. Learning Needs of Underrepresented Students (12 Points)							
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive		Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor		Comprehensive, Rigorous		Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Does not address the learning needs of teachers and/or principals or the learning needs of their underrepresented students to be successful in core academic areas;		Places limited emphasis on the learning needs of underrepresented students;		Places special emphasis on the learning needs of all participating teachers and/or principals and their students;		Includes a plan to emphasize instructional designs that address the learning needs of all participating teachers and/or principals to provide appropriate instruction for achievement of underrepresented students in core academic areas;	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Does not address how to help participants engage underrepresented students;		Describes intention to help participants identify own learning needs for engaging underrepresented students;		Provides examples of activities that are shown to be helpful in engaging underrepresented students;		Provides opportunities for participants to practice strategies shown to be helpful in motivating and engaging underrepresented students;	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Does not address the effect of teachers' and/or principals' low expectations of, and negative attitudes toward, culturally diverse students;		Includes reference to the effect of teachers' and/or principals' low expectation of culturally diverse students;		Includes activities that address the effect of teachers' and/or principals' low expectations of, and negative attitudes toward, culturally diverse students; and		Includes specified activities that address and improve teachers' and/or principals' low expectations of, and negative attitudes toward, culturally diverse students.	

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

F. Budget (16 Points)							
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive		Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor		Comprehensive, Rigorous		Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Does not provide a detailed budget breakdown defining each participating building/district's costs;		Provides an incomplete budget breakdown of insufficient detail defining each participating building/district's costs;		Provides a clear budget breakdown with detail for each expenditure related to the proposed project including costs per participating teacher and/or principal;		Provides extensive budget breakdown with sufficient detail to show attention to cost effectiveness, is adequate to support the proposed project, and complies with the budget requirements of the RFP;	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Shows no evidence of a relationship between budget items, project objectives, and anticipated results;		Shows occasional relationship between budget items and project objectives;		Shows evidence of relationship between most budget items, project objectives, and anticipated results;		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Shows evidence of a clear relationship between all budget items, project objectives, and anticipated results; and ▪ Identifies which partner "uses" the funds; 	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Includes disallowable expenditures;		Includes a mixture of allowable expenditures and those that are not consistent with quality professional development;		Includes only expenditures allowable under the grant guidelines;		Includes only expenditures allowable under the grant guidelines and appropriate in the context of quality professional development;	

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

F. Budget (16 Points)							
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive		Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor		Comprehensive, Rigorous		Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Does not include explanation;		Describes benefits to partners;		Delineates how expenditures directly benefit each partner;		Provides detailed breakdown of how expenditures directly benefit each partner;	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Does not include required expenses in budget: 5% for an independent evaluation of the project, or participation of the project director in directors' meeting in Lansing;		Refers to need for evaluation and directors' meeting, but does not include in budget;		Includes 5% for a state-level evaluation of the project coordinated by MDE and conducted by an independent evaluator; includes inadequate funds for participation of project director in grant meeting in Lansing during grant implementation period; and		Includes 5% for a state-level evaluation of the project coordinated by MDE and conducted by an independent evaluator and includes designated funds for internal evaluation; includes budget for project director's participation in grant meeting in Lansing during grant implementation period.	

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

G. Qualifications of Key Personnel (16 Points)							
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive		Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor		Comprehensive, Rigorous		Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Does not address the qualifications and experiences of the project director or other key personnel to assure completion of the project;		Provides marginal evidence of the qualifications and experiences of the project director and other key personnel to assure completion of the project;		Provides evidence that the project director and key personnel are qualified to assure the completion of the project and attainment of the goals;		Provides ample evidence of the qualifications of the project director and other key personnel to assure the project achieves all goals and objectives;	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Does not demonstrate that sufficient time will be allocated to assure the project achieves all goals and objectives;		Demonstrates an unclear allocation of work time to assure the project achieves all goals and objectives;		Demonstrates an awareness of the need for assigned work time and refers to what staff will be designated to work on behalf of the project goals and objectives;		Demonstrates that sufficient percentage of time is assigned to specific staff to assure the project achieves all goals and objectives;	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Makes no reference to groups that have been traditionally under-represented;		Addresses the need to include more participants who are traditionally underrepresented;		Demonstrates that the applicant (or a partner) will consider groups that have been traditionally underrepresented in their selection of staff and participants;		Demonstrates that the applicant (or a partner) has proven expertise in instructional and learning needs of underrepresented populations and in application of principles of Universal Education;	

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

G. Qualifications of Key Personnel (16 Points)							
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive		Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor		Comprehensive, Rigorous		Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Does not address qualifications of personnel to conduct formative assessments;		Addresses the need for formative assessment;		Provides evidence that project staff are qualified to conduct formative assessment; and		Provides evidence that project staff are qualified to conduct and analyze formative assessment and modify project activities as needed.	

H. Commitment and Capacity (20 Points)							
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive		Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor		Comprehensive, Rigorous		Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Does not involve a state-approved program in the content being proposed;		Involves state-approved institutions, but content programs do not have full approval;		Involves a state-approved institution, approved content program is in related area;		Involves a state-approved teacher preparation institution and the proposed professional development is in a specific content at the appropriate level, for which the institution has full state approval;	

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

H. Commitment and Capacity (20 Points)							
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive		Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor		Comprehensive, Rigorous		Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Describes an initial contact with the school in which an invitation was issued or how the proposal came from informal conversations with district teachers;		Describes how the university approached the school administrators to propose a partnership and discover the learning needs of district staff;		Describes how the university/school committed together to the proposed professional learning based on district data;		Describes in detail how the university/school partnership came about, how the data was analyzed and professional learning needs decided collaboratively. Includes the district's commitment for their teachers to participate;	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Does not show collaborative planning;		Describes planning by college/university staff and target school personnel;		Describes planning by representatives of college/university faculty, and administrators of target schools;		Describes planning by representatives of college/university faculty, teachers, and administrators of target schools, relevant professional organizations and informal education entities;	

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

H. Commitment and Capacity (20 Points)							
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive		Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor		Comprehensive, Rigorous		Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Does not discuss the facilitation skills of the project staff to be assigned to working with local schools/districts;		Describes only minimal experience facilitating professional development projects for local districts/schools in the content area proposed in this application;		Describes successful experiences in facilitating professional development projects for local districts/schools in the content area proposed in this application;		Lists previous successful experiences in facilitating professional development that engages partners of IHE and schools/districts in the content area proposed in this application;	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
Does not discuss plan to continue project or secure continuation funding;		Demonstrates that the applicant has an appreciation for the need to sustain long-term projects in rapidly changing teacher practices;		Includes a plan for continuing the project following the conclusion of federal assistance; and		Includes a detailed plan to identify and secure funding sources to continue the project following the conclusion of federal assistance.	

Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality Rubric 2008-2009

I. Includes School(s) Not Accredited or Not Making AYP				Add 10 Points			
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
						Add 10 points if the project proposes to address the reason that the high need school has not met AYP due to low performance on the MEAP in Mathematics or English Language Arts, or low performance by a subgroup, or is a school not accredited for curricular reasons.	

J. Penalty Points		Option: Penalty Points –5 Points/Page and -20 Points Technical Preparation					
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
						Proposals that exceed the allowed number of pages will be assessed a penalty of 5 points for each page beyond the 20 page narrative and 15 page appendix; and	
The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:		The Proposal:	
						Proposals using less than 11-point font size and no less than 1-inch margins will be assigned a penalty of 20 points.	



**2008-2009 Title II, Part A(3) Improving Teacher Quality
Competitive Grants Program
Technical Assistance**

Please select one of the following sessions:

- ☐ **Webinar: May 28, 2008, 1:30 pm – 3:00 pm**
Hosted at: Hannah Building, 608 W. Allegan,
Lansing, Michigan
*Registration limited to **one site** per organization;
webinar arrangements will be provided to the first
twenty organizations to register.

OR

- ☐ **Meeting: June 4, 2008, 9:00 am – 11:30 pm**
Michigan NCA State Office
826 Municipal Way
Lansing, Michigan
*Registration limited to **one person** per
organization.

Registration Due: May 21, 2008

ATTN: Claudia Nicol

FAX: (517) 373-0542

Contact Name: _____

Organization: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ Zip: _____

E-Mail: _____

Please contact Claudia Nicol @ (517) 335-1151 or NicolC@michigan.gov
if further information is needed.